

42390P12491

PATENT

REMARKS

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite. Claims 1 to 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,719,800 ("Mittal").

The applicants have amended claim 8 to read as originally filed. This amendment renders moot the rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §112, because the line cited by the examiner as not clear has been deleted.

With respect to the rejection claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), the examiner argues that Mittal teaches monitoring the activity level of a processor to determine a power state, triggering one of a plurality of power control mechanisms, activating a first power control mechanism if the power state meets a first threshold, monitoring a status associated with the first power control mechanism, and activating a second power control mechanism responsive to the monitored status.

In response, the applicants argue that Mittal does not teach or disclose all of the elements of the claimed invention. For example, Mittal does not describe activating a second power control mechanism responsive to a monitored status. In column 5, lines 13 to 43, and in Figure 1(a), Mittal describes and illustrates mode controller 107 switching functional unit 105 between a normal mode of operation and a reduced power mode based on activity level 109 generated by activity monitor 106. However, this is not a second power control mechanism. Granted, column 5, lines 1 to 12, does state that Mittal's technique can be used in conjunction with or in lieu of an approach of reducing overall power consumption by reducing voltage and/or clock rate. However, Mittal's technique does not include activating a power control mechanism responsive to a monitored status associated with any other power control mechanism. In contrast, Mittal's technique is "independent of the technique of reducing overall power consumption by reducing voltage and/or clock rate" (column 5, lines 1-3).

The applicants reserve the right to argue that Mittal fails to disclose any other element of the claimed invention, but for at least the reason above, Mittal does not anticipate the invention as set forth in claim 8. Therefore, Mittal does not anticipate claims 9 to 12, as least because they depend on claim 8, and Mittal does not describe each

R

42390P12491

PATENT

and every element of claim 8. The applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8 to 12.

Furthermore, the examiner argues that because claims 1-7 and 13-19 are directed to a system implementing the method of claims 8-12, Mittal teaches the invention as set forth in claims 1-7 and 13-19. Therefore, the applicants respectfully argue that by overcoming, by the above argument, the examiner's argument with respect to claims 8-12, the applicants have also overcome the examiner's argument with respect to claims 1-7 and 13-19, and the applicants request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-7 and 13-19.

42390P12491


PATENT

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, the applicants respectfully submit that all of the rejections have been overcome and that claims 1-19 are in condition for allowance. The applicant therefore respectfully requests the issuance of a Notice of Allowance. Please charge any necessary fees, including extension fees, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0221.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 20, 2004



Thomas R. Lane
Registration No. 42,781